

**Jack Scott, Chair  
Bob Margett  
John Vasconcellos**

**April 21, 2003  
Upon Adjournment of Session – Room 113**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I.     <u>Student Assessment</u></b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. Governor's Proposals:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Assessments in Career Education</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. California High School Exit Exam</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. California English Language Development Test</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Golden State Exam</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>B. LAO Proposals:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. STAR - Norm-Referenced Test</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. STAR- Primary Language Test</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Physical Fitness Test</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>II.    <u>School Accountability</u></b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1. II/USP and HP</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. LAO Alternative Accountability Proposal</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>III.   <u>NCLB – Assessment &amp; Accountability Programs</u></b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV.    <u>Consent Calendar – Special Funds</u></b>	<b>16</b>

## I. Student Assessment

### Background:

The Governor's Budget provides \$130.4 million in funding for support of student assessments in California, including \$102.8 million in state General Funds and \$27.6 million in federal funds authorized by Title VI of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

These assessment funds cover the costs of administering a variety of specific state assessments that measure student performance. (Appendix A identifies these state assessments.) These assessment costs also cover test development, as well as, data collection, analysis and reporting.

Funding for individual assessment programs, as proposed by the Governor in 2003-04, is summarized in the chart below. The Governor proposes to increase assessment programs by \$798,000 overall, above the Governor's proposed midyear budget. [While not reflected on the chart below, the Governor's proposed 2003-04 budget for assessment programs is \$1.6 million lower than the 2002-03 budget as revised by SB 18X.]

Assessment Program:	2003-04 Governor's Budget			Change from Governor's 2002-03 Midyear Proposal		
	General Fund	Federal Funds	Total	General Funds	Federal Funds	Total
STAR	60,836,000	3,569,000	<b>64,405,000</b>	0	-1,480,000	<b>-1,480,000</b>
California High School Exit Exam	18,27,000	2,900,000	<b>21,167,000</b>	0	2,900,000	<b>2,900,000</b>
California English Language Development Test	11,437,000	7,100,000	<b>18,537,000</b>	7,000,000	-500,000	<b>6,500,000</b>
Golden State Exam	5,933,000		<b>5,933,000</b>	-1,500,000	0	<b>-1,500,000</b>
Physical Performance Test	1,058,000		<b>1,058,000</b>	-144,000	0	<b>-144,000</b>
Assessments in Career Education	0			-871,000	0	<b>-871,000</b>
NCLB Longitudinal Database		6,880,000	<b>6,880,000</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
Test Development	1,407,000	4,083,000	<b>5,490,000</b>	-2,500,000	383,000	<b>-2,117,000</b>
Assessment Review and Reporting	3,913,000		<b>3,913,000</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
Assessment Data Collection		1,800,000	<b>1,800,000</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
Alternative Schools Accountability Model		775,000	<b>775,000</b>	0	-670,000	<b>-670,000</b>
Students with Disabilities		500,000	<b>500,000</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
Unspecified			<b>0</b>	0	-1,820,000	<b>-1,820,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>102,851,000</b>	<b>27,607,000</b>	<b>130,458,000</b>	<b>1,985,000</b>	<b>-1,187,000</b>	<b>798,000</b>

Source: Legislative Analyst's Office

The Standardized Testing and Reporting program (STAR) is the cornerstone of the state's student assessment system. Nearly half of the funding proposed for student assessment programs in 2003-04 is directed to the STAR program.

The STAR program includes three separate achievement tests that cover core subject areas for students in grades 2-11 – (1) the California Achievement Test 6 (CAT 6)-- a norm-referenced achievement test; (2) the California Standards Test (CST) – a criterion-referenced achievement test aligned to our state's own curriculum standards; and (3) the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE/2) -- a norm-referenced achievement test for English learners whose primary language is Spanish.

### **Budget Issues/Actions:**

**A. Governor's Budget Proposals** -- As summarized in the chart above, the Governor proposes a number of changes to specific student assessment programs for the 2003-04 budget:

**1. Elimination of Assessments in Career Education (\$0.9 million savings)** – The Governor proposes elimination of the Assessments in Career Education (ACE) program for a savings of \$871,000 in 2003-04. The Governor proposes using the STAR test to fulfill federal requirements for reporting achievement in vocational education.

ACE exams are voluntary, end-of-course exams that measure achievement in career technical subjects. Exams cover a number of subjects including agriculture, computer science and information systems, health care, food services and hospitality, and technology. ACE exams are available for students in grades 7-12. These exams are not standards-based; but criterion referenced tests.

The ACE exams are not required under state law, but voluntary tests. According to the LAO, the number of students participating in the tests is declining and the cost of the tests is high relative to the costs for other tests.

**2. Additional Federal Funds for California High School Exit Exam Workload (\$2.9 million increase).** The Governor proposes to appropriate \$2.9 million in new federal Title VI funds to cover district apportionments for an additional 367,000 test takers (\$1.1 million) and to pay for associated exam workbooks (\$1.8 million).

The California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) measures state-adopted curriculum standards for English language arts (reading and writing) through grade 10 and mathematics through Algebra I. Beginning in 2003-04, California students will have to pass a high school exit exam, in order to earn a high school diploma. The new law requires the test be given to all 10<sup>th</sup> graders. If students do not pass the test, they may take it again until they pass.

The CAHSEE has been administered for nearly three cycles beginning in spring 2001. Data are available for two cycles – spring 2001 and 2002.

As indicated in the chart below, the cumulative passing rates for students scheduled to graduate in 2004 now stands at 48 percent – so only half of the state's students have passed the exam so far. The cumulative passage rates of other groups of students is even lower – only 19 percent for English learners and 13 percent for students with disabilities.

**Estimated Cumulative Passage Rates,  
Math and English Combined,  
Spring 2001 and 2002**

<b>Class of 2004</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>Asian/ Asian American</b>	<b>White (Not Hispanic)</b>	<b>Hispanic/ Latino</b>	<b>African/ American</b>	<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>English learners</b>	<b>Special Education</b>
<b>Passage Rates</b>	48	70	65	30	28	NA	19	13

*Source: California Department of Education, September 2002. Produced from 2001 and 2002 Human Research Organization (HumRRO) data files.*

AB 1609 (Calderon), enacted in 2001, requires an independent study to evaluate the state's readiness to require the exam for graduation. The study is due May 1, 2003. Upon consideration of this study, the State Board of Education is authorized to delay the date when passage of the exam will be required, if they act by August 1, 2003.

**3. New Funds for California English Language Development Test Workload and Backfill (\$6.5 million increase) --** The Governor proposes a \$5 million increase for contract costs associated with the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) in 2003-04. In addition, the Governor proposes \$1.5 million to cover district apportionments for an additional 300,000 test takers.

These adjustment are funded through an \$7 million increase in state General Funds, offset by a reduction of \$500,000 in Title VI funds for these purposes.

The CELDT was developed pursuant to legislation requiring a statewide English-language assessment program for students in grades K-12. The purpose of the CELDT is to (1) identify students as English-learners in order to assure English development and access to education services and curriculum, (2) determine student proficiency in English to monitor student progress, and (3) assess student progress in acquiring English proficiency for purposes of reclassifying students as English-proficient.

The CELDT is required to assess listening, speaking, reading and writing and must be aligned to statewide standards for English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education. The State Board approved English Language Development standards in July 1999.

School districts have been required to assess English learners using the CELDT since 2001. Nearly 1.3 million English learners, approximately 21 percent of all students statewide, participated in the CELDT in 2002.

**4. Reduce Golden State Exam Funding (\$1.5 million savings)** -- The Governor proposes to reduce funding for the Golden State Exam (GSE) in 2003-04 by an additional \$1.5 million below the Governor's proposed midyear budget level. Proposed cuts reflect contract savings for reduced testing. The Governor's proposal retains \$5.9 million for the GSE program in 2003-04.

Funding for GSE dropped significantly from the 2002-03 Budget Act--from \$15.4 million to \$7.4 million, as compared to the Governor's mid-year proposal. SB 18X reduced 2002-03 funding even further, to \$6.6 million.

The GSE provides voluntary, end-of-course exams for students in grades 7-12. There are thirteen separate course exams, which are all tied to state standards. These course exams cover several subject areas including math, English language/arts, social science, science and Spanish.

Approximately 1.2 million students take GSE exams. Students that do well on the exams can qualify for Golden State Merit Diplomas.

Recent legislation (Chapter 722/2001) required GSE tests to be integrated into the California Standards Test to reduce testing time and testing duplication. Three tests have been integrated into the California Standards Test-- reading/literature, written

composition, and high school mathematics. The California State University (CSU) system plans to use these three tests for placing students, beginning in 2003-04.

The \$5.9 million proposed by the Governor for GSE in 2003 will require many GSE exams to be eliminated, but according to DOF, the three exams integrated into CST would be given priority for funding.

**The LAO recommends the Golden State Exam be discontinued for an additional savings of \$5.9 million in 2003-04.** The LAO gives two reasons for this position: (1) GSE tests are not mandated, but voluntary and are not used as a part of the school accountability system, and (2) GSE is duplicative of other tests that could be used to demonstrate high achievement, such as Advanced Placement Exams.

The LAO is not persuaded that the GSE has to be maintained for placement purposes at CSU since relatively few students at CSU will have taken the test and other tests will have to be utilized anyway.

**B. LAO Proposals** – In addition to elimination of the Golden State Exam described above, the LAO recommends the following additional budget reductions to student assessments:

**1. Reduce Grade Levels Tested on the STAR Norm-Referenced Test (\$10 million savings)** – The LAO recommends reducing \$10 million in funding for the STAR program by eliminating eight grade levels tested on the STAR norm-referenced test, which is currently the California Achievement Test 6 (CAT/6). Specifically, the LAO recommends limiting this test to grades 4 and 8, rather than testing students in grades 2 through 11.

The Standardized Testing and Reporting program (STAR) includes three separate achievement tests that cover core subject areas for students in grades 2-11. The two major STAR tests are the – the California Achievement Test 6 (CAT/6) and the California Standards Test (CST). These two achievement tests are taken by nearly 4.6 million students in California every year and form the basis of the state's Academic Performance Index (API).

A third test – the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE/2) –is required for English learners who have been enrolled in public school for one year or less. Overall, 108,000 English learners took the SABE/2 in 2002.

The LAO recommendation would reduce the emphasis on the CAT/6, which as a norm-referenced test, allows comparisons for a national sample of students. This change would place greater emphasis on the California Standards Test – a criterion-referenced test aligned to our state’s own content standards.

As initially established in 1997, the STAR program relied uniquely on a state norm-referenced test – then the Stanford Achievement Test, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (SAT/9). The SAT/9 has been replaced by the CAT/6 in 2003. Over time, standards-based components were added to the SAT/9, as content standards in core curriculum areas were developed and approved.

Legislation in recent years has strengthened the role of standards-based testing and reduced the role of the norm-referenced test for the STAR programs. As enacted in 2001, SB 233/Alpert made the standards-based STAR test – now the California Standards Test -- a separate test from the norm-referenced test. In addition, this new law shortened and deleted portions of the norm-referenced STAR test – now the CAT/6.

The standards-based test has also grown to comprise a greater portion of the API – the state’s school accountability measure -- in recent years. In 2001, the norm-referenced test (NRT) – then the SAT/9 -- accounted for 100 percent of the API for elementary and middle schools. In 2003, the new norm-referenced test – the CAT/6—will account for only 20 percent of the API; the California Standards Test (CST) will account for 80 percent.

**API Components, Elementary and Middle Schools, 2001-2003**

<b>2001</b>		<b>2002</b>		<b>2003</b>	
<b>SAT/9 (NRT)</b>	<b>CST (CRT)</b>	<b>SAT/9 (NRT)</b>	<b>CST (CRT)</b>	<b>CAT/6 (NRT)</b>	<b>CST (CRT)</b>
100%	NA	64%	36%	20%	80%

A similar trend is evident with the API for high schools. In 2001, the norm-referenced test – then the SAT/9 -- accounted for 100 percent of the API for high schools. In 2003, the new norm-referenced test – the CAT/6—will account for only 12 percent of the API, whereas the California Standards Test will account for 73 percent and the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) will account for 15 percent.

**API Components, High Schools, 2001-2003**

2001		2002		2003		
SAT/9 (NRT)	CST (CRT)	SAT/9 (NRT)	CST (CRT)	CAT/6 (NRT)	CST (CRT)	CAHSE E
100%	NA	76%	24%	12%	73%	15

*Staff notes that reducing emphasis on the CAT/6 appears consistent with recent legislation and state policy that has shortened and separated the norm-referenced test within the STAR program and significantly reduced its weight and importance in the API.*

*Staff further notes that there are efficiencies in eliminating the number of grade levels tested on California's norm-referenced achievement test – the CAT/6. These efficiencies would reduce test-taking time for students, reduce test duplication and save money at the state and local level.*

*Therefore, staff notes that the Subcommittee may want to retain funding for at least one high school grade – possibly 11<sup>th</sup> grade -- in addition to the two grades the LAO recommends retaining -- 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The performance of high school students on norm-referenced tests has been poor compared and contrasted to students in elementary and middle schools. (See Appendix B & C) For this reason, some additional information provided by the CAT/6 for high schools appears worthy of retaining at this time.*

**2. Eliminate Primary Language Test Requirement (\$1.6 million savings)** –The LAO recommends elimination of the requirement for a primary language test as a part of the STAR program, which would eliminate funding for the SABLE/2 test. This change would save \$1.6 million in state General Funds and would require a change in statute.

Current law establishing the STAR program requires school districts to administer a primary language test to English learners in grades 2-11 if they have been enrolled in a California public school for less than one year and if a primary language test is available. Additional primary language testing for English learners beyond one year is optional for districts.

To date, only one primary language achievement test has been adopted for English learners – the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABLE/2). The SABLE/2



assesses new students --whose primary language is Spanish -- in reading, language, spelling and math.

Approximately 108,000 of the state's 1.2 million English learner students take the SABE/2 annually.

The LAO provides the following reasons for eliminating the SABE/2:

- (1) School districts use other tests for placement and monitoring that are more useful;
- (2) The test is not consistent with the state's emphasis on English language development;
- (3) A small portion of students take the test;
- (4) The test does not fit within the framework of the state's accountability system because a different set of students is tested each year; and
- (5) The test is not aligned with state standards, as required by NCLB.

*Staff notes that primary language testing has been a part of California's – assessment system – specifically the STAR system -- from the outset. While a norm-referenced test, the SABE/2 is the only content test in Spanish and provides some gauge of content knowledge for English learners. Development of a Spanish language test that is aligned to state standards, such as the California Standards Test, would be preferable to a norm-referenced test in Spanish. However, it would appear premature to eliminate the SABE/2 – the only content assessment for English learners – prior to the development of a standards- based test in Spanish.*

**3. Eliminate the Physical Fitness Test Mandate (\$1.1 million savings)** – The LAO recommends elimination of the Physical Fitness Test, as funded by the state mandates program, for a savings of \$1.1 million in 2003-04.

The LAO supports the elimination of this test on the basis it would reduce the number of required state assessments, reduce testing burdens, increase instructional time, and make \$1.1 million available for other educational priorities.

The Physical Fitness Test is a mandated state assessment for students in grades 5,7, and 9. The test was required by legislation enacted in 1995 – AB 975/Alpert.

The State Board of Education has designated the Fitnessgram as the state's physical performance test. The test measure six areas of fitness – aerobic capacity,

body composition, abdominal strength, trunk extension strength, upper body strength, and flexibility.

In 2001, approximately 90 percent of school districts reported data for the Fitnessgram. Of the 1.2 million students in grades 5, 7, and 9 who took this test, a full 77 percent did not meet the minimum standards for physical fitness.

Current law requires physical education for students in grades 1 through 12. Physical education is required for a minimum of 200 minutes every 10 school days for students in grades 1-6. In grades 7-12, physical education is required for a minimum of 400 minutes every 10 school days.

Under current law, a school board or a county office of education can grant a student an exemption from physical education for two years any time during grades 10 to 12.

A recent analysis conducted by CDE found that higher academic achievement was associated with higher levels of fitness for students at each of the three grade levels measured. The analysis, which matched student SAT/9 scores to Fitnessgram scores in 2001, also found that students who met minimum fitness levels in three or more physical fitness areas showed the greatest gains in academic achievement at all three grade levels.

Legislative analyses from the Senate Health and Human Services Committee describes research that indicates a two-fold increase in the youth obesity rate over the past two decades, and a three-fold increase for adolescents. Research also indicates that one-in-four obese children has early signs of Type 2 Diabetes and nearly half of the children and adolescents now diagnosed with diabetes have Type 2, formerly called "adult onset."

*Staff notes that there has been renewed emphasis on the Physical Fitness Exam as an important component of the state's assessment system. This new interest stems, in part, from the outcomes of these tests, which indicate poor fitness levels for California students. These trends appear to indicate a continued need for accountability in physical fitness and health education. In addition, there is concern about the rising incidence of childhood obesity and its connection to preventable childhood diseases such as Type 2 Diabetes.*

## **II. School Accountability**

Current law, under the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) establishes a statewide school accountability for our K-12 public schools, which builds upon state curriculum standards and state assessment tests. Major components of the PSAA include:

- ◆ An Academic Performance Index (API) to rank schools statewide on academic achievement and other measures,
- ◆ An Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program and a High Priority Schools Grant program to provide interventions for schools that need help and sanctions for schools that fail to make progress, and
- ◆ A Governor's High Achieving/Improving Schools Program to provide incentives and financial rewards for schools that show progress.

There are two major state intervention and sanction programs in California – the Immediate Intervention/ Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) and the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HP). As summarized by the LAO:

*The II/USP program targets schools in the five lowest deciles on the API that are not meeting API targets, and provides \$200 per pupil for two to three years for school improvement. Schools that do not make significant growth are sanctioned.*

*The HP program targets the lowest performing schools starting with schools in decile one – the lowest decile on the API – and provides \$400 per student for three to four years. Schools that do not make significant growth are sanctioned.*

In addition, there are two federal intervention and sanctions programs – the Comprehensive School Reform and Demonstration Program (CSRD) and the new and evolving program for Program Improvement schools under the No Child Left Behind Act. As summarized by the LAO:

*The CSRD program provides grants to schools to do comprehensive research-based reform and provides \$200 to \$400 per pupil for three years. This program is generally integrated into the II/USP and HP programs.*

*The NCLB program requires [Title I] schools not making “adequate yearly progress” to implement progressively stringent interventions under Program Improvement. No additional funding is provided to schools in Program Improvement.*

Funding for the three interventions and sanctions program that provide funding to schools is summarized in the chart below.

**K-12 Intervention and Sanction Programs,  
State and Federal Funds  
2003-04 Governor's Budget  
(In millions)**

Program	2002-03 Budget Act	2002-03 Mid-Year Governor's Proposal	Proposed 2003-04	Change from 2002-03 Mid Year	% Change from 2002-03 Mid Year
<b>II/USP (GF)</b>	\$184.6	\$164.6	<b>\$104.6</b>	-60.0	-36.4
<b>HP (GF)</b>	217.0	172.5	<b>178.4</b>	5.8	3.4 %
<b>CSRD (Fed)</b>	39.7	39.7	<b>39.7</b>	--	--
<b>Sanctions (GF/Fed)</b>	35.1	34.5	<b>34.4</b>	-0.1	-0.2
<b>Total</b>	\$476.4	\$411.3	<b>\$357.1</b>	-\$54.2	-13.2 %

The Governor's Budget proposes **\$357.1 million** for state and federal intervention and sanction programs for low-performing schools in 2003-04. This includes \$288.0 million in state General Funds and approximately \$69.1 million in federal funds.

**1. II/USP & HP**

The Governor's Budget proposes a total of **\$283.0 million** in state General Funds for the II/USP and HP programs in 2003-04. This level of funding reflects a reduction of \$118.6 million, compared to the 2002-03 Budget Act – \$80 million for II/USP and \$38.6 million for HP programs.

This overall reduction continues 2002-03 reductions proposed by the Governor's mid-year revision, which were rejected by the Legislature.

More specifically, the Governor's Budget includes:

- **II/USP** -- The Governor proposes **\$104.6 million** for II/USP in 2003-04. This reflects an \$80 million reduction to the program below the 2002-03 Budget Act. Most of this reduction is explained by \$60 million savings from schools in the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort who exit the program after three years and from 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort schools (20 percent) that may not be eligible to receive third year funding for the

program. Another \$20 million in savings results from the across-the-board cuts the Governor proposed for categorical programs.

- **HP** – The Governor proposes **\$178.4 million** for HP in 2003-04. This reflects a decrease of \$38.6 million below the 2002-03 Budget Act. These reductions are explained by proposed across-the-board reductions. In addition, these reductions reflect savings from not funding a new HP cohort in 2002-03 – an action rejected by the Legislature.

The final 2002-03 budget, as revised by SB 18 X, provides \$146.0 million for II/USP and \$180.0 million for the HP program. These changes reflect a \$76 million reduction in 2002-03 -- \$38.6 million for II/USP and \$37.4 million for HP – to realign funding for the final 20 percent payment for these programs. This change shifts these payments, due in October 2003, from 2002-03 funds to 2003-04 funds. This action is not intended to reduce or delay funding for programs.

**Based upon the Legislature’s action in SB 18X, the LAO believes that the Governor’s Budget underfunds the II/USP and HP program by an estimated \$69 million in 2003-04.** The Legislature’s actions to reject across-the-board reductions, to retain a 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort of HP, and to realign the timing of payments are the reasons behind this difference.

**Specifically, the LAO estimates that \$132 million is necessary to fund II/USP in 2003-04.** The Governor’s Budget is **\$36 million** below this level. Without additional funding, per pupil funding for schools will be reduced from \$200 to \$158 in 2003-04. Current law permits such adjustments to per pupil funding.

**The LAO estimates that \$220 million is needed to fully fund HP cohorts one and two in 2003-04.** This is **\$42 million** below the Governor’s Budget. Without additional funding, per pupil funding for schools will need to drop from approximately \$400 to \$323. Current law does not provide authority for such adjustments, so trailer bill language would be required.

## **2. LAO Alternative Proposal for Restructured Accountability System**

As an alternative to either funding the \$69 million shortfall in the Governor’s Budget for the II/USP and HP programs or reducing per pupil funding for these programs, the LAO recommends setting aside an estimated **\$50 million** to fund both shortfalls and a redesigned accountability system.

The LAO envisions that such a system could be funded with a combination of state and federal funds, including Title I, Set-Aside funds for Program Improvement.

In making this recommendation, the LAO notes a number of challenges with the existing system. The LAO recognizes large differences among the four state and federal accountability systems. Notable differences include: growth measures and targets; sanction and intervention requirements – eligibility, funding, timing, types of interventions/sanctions; and entities responsible for interventions. Overall, the LAO finds these differences create an “unwieldy” system.

In offering a restructured framework for an integrated accountability system, the LAO recommends:

- Focusing state interventions at the school district level and using funds to build capacity at the district level for intervening with schools;
- Targeting state interventions to the neediest schools – those in decile one of the API;
- Providing less intensive interventions and sanctions at higher performing schools and limiting interventions to schools in deciles two through ten (to no more than what is required under the statewide system of school support for Title I schools);
- Redesigning the HP program to serve as the primary accountability program for state and federal purposes;
- Transitioning schools in state intervention programs to this new, integrated accountability system expeditiously, while following through on sanction commitments, and using “significant growth” as the criterion for further funding; and
- Changing the definition of proficiency for purposes of NCLB to passage of the HSEE for students in grades 10-12 and to being “on track” to pass the HSEE for students in grades 2-8.

Beyond this framework, the LAO has developed a number of specific policy recommendations that will be outlined for the Subcommittee.

### **III. NCLB Accountability Programs**

The Governor’s Budget authorizes ongoing funding for several federal funding programs authorized under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Several of these programs provide important funding for implementation of our state’s

assessment and accountability systems, which are undergoing changes in order to meet the new requirements of NCLB.

Given the significant amount of new and ongoing federal funding available for assessment and accountability purposes under NCLB, the Subcommittee will need to review expenditure plans for each of these programs. These plans should reflect updated estimates for federal funds being appropriated to California for federal fiscal year 2003, which will be available to California for the 2003-04 state fiscal year.

*Staff notes that expenditure plans are needed prior to the May 12<sup>th</sup> Subcommittee hearing for the following federal items.*

- Title I, Low Performing Schools (6110-123-0890);
- Title I, School Improvement Set-Aside Funds (6110-136-0890); and
- Title VI, State Assessment (Item 6110-113-0890).

*The Subcommittee requests the assistance of the CDE, DOF and LAO in developing these plans. These plans should address both budget year appropriations, and any carryover funds from the current year that could be built into the budget year.*

**IV. Consent Items -- Special Fund Items --**

Staff recommends that the following Special Fund Items be approved as budgeted. No issues have been raised with regard to any of these Items:

**Special Funds**

1. 6110-001-0178, Support, Schoolbus Driver Instructor Training, payable from the Driver Training Penalty Assessment Fund, \$1,035,000.
2. 6110-001-0231, Support, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$1,003,000.
3. 6110-001-0687, Support, California State Agency for Donated Food Distribution, payable from the Donated Food Revolving Fund, \$5,254,000.
4. 6110-001-0975, Support, Library and Learning Services, payable from the California Public School Library Protection Fund, \$15,000.
5. 6110-001-6036, Support, Administrative Services to local educational agencies, payable from the 2002 State Schools Facilities Fund, \$2,188,000.
6. 6110-006-0814, Support, State Special Schools, payable from the California State Lottery Education Fund, \$133,000.
7. 6110-101-0231, Local Assistance, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$3,793,000.
8. 6110-101-0814, Local Assistance, School Apportionment, payable from the California State Lottery Education Fund, \$799,421,000.
9. 6110-101-0975, Local Assistance, Library and Learning Resources, payable California Public School Library Protection Fund, \$345,000.
10. 6110-102-0231, Local Assistance, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$23,200,000.
11. 6110-301-0660, Capital Outlay, payable from the Public Buildings Construction Fund, \$5,600,000. California School for the Deaf in Riverside – Preliminary working plans, working drawings, construction and equipment.



**Appendix A.**

**California Assessment System, 2003-03**

<http://goldmine.cde.ca.gov/statetests/assessys.pdf>

**Attachment B.**

**SAT/9 Reading Results – 1998-2000**

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/news/releases2002/rel28attachre1.pdf>

**Attachment C.**

**SAT/9 Mathematics Results – 1998-2000**

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/news/releases2002/rel28attachma1.pdf>